



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/381,400	02/03/2000	YOSHINORI MIYAKI	843.37610X00	3904

20457 7590 04/03/2003

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, ALEXANDER O

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary

Control No.

09/381,400

Patent Under Reexamination

MIYAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander O Williams

Art Unit

2826

All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative):

(1) Alexander O Williams

(3) _____

(2) David C. Oren

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 March 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ patent owner 2) ☒ patent owner's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.
Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."

Claim(s) discussed: 22-36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamamoto and Kajihara et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN **ONE MONTH** FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

cc: Requester (if third party requester)



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's arguments that there were no motivation to use Yamamoto's organic layer on a chip with Kajihara et al.'s die with an insulation layer on the top of the chip was acknowledged. See Examiner's notes for further detail. No agreement was decided at this time. Examiner's Notes: Claim 22, applicants arguments were there is no motivation to use Yamamoto's organic layer on a chip, since the die pad was not shorter than the die, with Kajihara et al.'s die with an insulative layer on the top of the chip and having a shorter die pad. Applicant's argument that Yamamoto also notes that resin does not touch underneath the die surface and on top of the organic film on the top of the chip. This is applicant's reason that the reference should not be used to combine or no motivation. Claim 29 argues basically the same.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/38/400	3/2/2000	Miyaki et al	843.37410X00

EXAMINER	
A Williams	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2826	22

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Alexander Williams (3) _____
(2) David C. Oren (4) _____

Date of Interview 3/25/03

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 22-36

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamamoto and Kajihara et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's arguments that there were no motivation to use Yamamoto's organic layer on a chip with Kajihara et al.'s die with an insulating layer on the top of the chip was acknowledged. See Examiner's Notes for further detail. No agreement was decided at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

[Signature]

3/25/03